

09/845,231

F0630/AMDP630US

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7, 28, 29 and 35-37 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1-5, 29, 28, and 35-37 have been amended to more clearly emphasize novel aspects of the claimed invention. Claims 6-27, and 30-34 have been cancelled. A listing of the claims is presented on pp. 2-5.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 35-37 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 35-37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Maguire, *et al.* (U.S. 6,038,525) (hereinafter Maguire). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Maguire does not teach or suggest each and every limitation as recited in the subject claims.

A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaa Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

The claimed invention relates to a system and method to facilitate the monitoring of defects and impurities in thin films and controlling thin film deposition in semiconductor manufacturing. Specifically, amended independent claim 1, and similarly independent claims 28 and 35-37, recites a *processor that partitions a mask into a plurality of grid blocks mapped to portions of the wafer and determines deposition parameter adjustments at the...grid blocks for ...one or more deposition components*. By controlling thin film deposition at *grid blocks mapped to selected portions* of a semiconductor wafer, an increase in chip consistency, quality, yield, and reliability can be achieved. The cited reference, Maguire, does not teach or disclose these novel aspects of applicants' claimed invention.

09/845,231

F0630/AMDP630US

Instead, Maguire relates to controlling a pulsed laser deposition process where a spectroscopy is used to acquire data from a substrate as it is being coated with a film. (See Maguire, Abstract). Specifically, the cited reference discloses a processor that analyzes the spectroscopy data in order determine the current thickness of the film. (See col. 4, lines 39-41). However, the cited reference is silent towards *partitioning a mask of the substrate into a plurality of grid blocks mapped to portions of the substrate in order to determine deposition parameter adjustments at the grid blocks*, as claimed in applicants' invention. Accordingly, reversal of this rejection with respect to independent claims 1, 28 and 35-37, and claims that depend there from, is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claim 3 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 3 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maguire in view of Moslehi (U.S. 5,270,222). This rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Neither Maguire nor Moslehi, alone or in combination, teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention.

As discussed *supra*, Maguire does not teach or suggest all limitations recited in independent claim 1 from which claim 3 depends. In addition, the cited secondary reference fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maguire. In particular, Moslehi provides a sensor for the diagnosis and prognosis of semiconductor device fabrication processes by measuring surface reflectances and transmittances of wafers. (See Moslehi, Abstract). However, the cited secondary reference is silent towards utilizing *partitioned grid blocks that are mapped to portions of the wafer*. Thus, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 28 and 29 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 28 and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maguire in view of Gevelber, *et al.* (U.S. 6,162,488) (hereinafter Gevelber). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reason. Neither Maguire nor Gevelber, *et al.*, alone or in combination, teach or suggest applicants' claimed invention.

As discussed *supra*, Maguire does not teach or suggest all limitations recited in amended independent claims 28, from which claim 29 depends. Further, Gevelber, *et al.* fails to make up

09/845,231

F0630/AMDP630US

for the aforementioned deficiencies of Maguire. In particular, Gevelber, *et al.* is silent towards *mapping a plurality of grid blocks to portions of a surface*. Thus, withdrawal of this rejection is requested.

IV. Rejection of Claim 7 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maguire in view of Robinson, *et al.* (U.S. 5,629,137) (hereinafter Robinson). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn due to applicants' cancellation of claim 7.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [AMDP630US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin

Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP
24TH Floor, National City Center
1900 E. 9TH Street
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731